

"These Are The Facts of The Case"

As many of the readers of the "STANDARD" already know, I was called to appear before the District Board of the Texas District of the United Pentecostal Church and later before the General Board in St. Louis for publishing the booklet entitled, "SCRIPTURAL TITHING AND NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH GOVERNMENT", and the Article entitled, "THE CASE FOR THE SOVEREIGN CHURCH", which appeared in the February issue of the Standard.

Brethren from all over the nation have either written or called me asking for details of the matter. Many false rumors are making their rounds. Therefore to clarify the matter and present the facts clearly and forthrightly, I am herewith publishing the correspondence or files of the case. I have nothing to hide. I am fully convinced of the righteousness of the cause that I have championed. And inasmuch as it is my character and my reputation and ministry that is jeopardized, these brethren who occupy positions on these respective boards certainly should not mind the facts of the case being made public.

My summons to appear before the Texas District Board was handed me March 12, 1968 and reads as follows:

BROTHER BURR:

The Texas District Board is asking you to appear before them at their 4:00 business session today, March 12. This is not a summons for trial, but for investigation according to article 6. Section 5, paragraph 14.

UNSIGNED

I made my appearance at 4:00 O'clock and later that night around mid-night. Discussion lasted probably several hours, mainly over the question of the Sovereign Church. At the end of the final discussion I was handed the following resolution passed by the Texas District Board.

March 12 1968

Be it resolved that we disapprove of many remarks contained in the booklet, Scriptural Tithing and New Testament Church Government", and the article, "The case for the Sovereign Church" in the Apostolic Standard by M. E. Burr, Volume I, Number I, derogatory to this organization; and believing that the spirit in which it is written and distributed among our people is in opposition to the interest of this organization and the way it is now organized.

This dissent of the author is in direct opposition to his previous editorial, "The Value of Church Organization", written in the Apostolic

Sentinel. We feel that the opinions expressed are only theories of the Author but so worded as to make it seem that all facts of church history are on his side and that the present structure is not Biblical, but is taken from the Catholic Church. This, in the opinion of the District Board, is only the Author's interpretation, and such teachings were often expressed in the early organizational days by those who opposed and fought against organization.

Inasmuch as these remarks in his articles are in direct opposition and are contradictory to his previous teachings, and the teachings of the United Pentecostal Church:

The Texas District Board requires that Brother M. E. Burr offer an apology in writing for statements contained in the above named publications satisfactory to the District Board, same to be printed in the Apostolic Sentinel and the Apostolic Standard.

Furthermore, he is to cease publishing such remarks in articles or booklets in the future.

This apology must be in the hands of the Texas District Board before the closing of this conference now in session.

Failure to comply with this will necessitate further and more drastic action. (Note . . . I have given the spelling and punctuating exactly as it was given me.)

UNSIGNED

My answer to them was as follows:

March 14, 1968

The District Board
Texas District - United Pentecostal Church
Lufkin, Texas

Dear Brethren:
Christian Greetings:

Your resolution dated March 12, 1968 was handed me by Brother B. H. McCoy. I have taken as much time as possible to prayerfully and sincerely consider it. Please believe me when I say that my answer is not written with any bitterness or rancor, but only in the pursuance of truth and peace and fraternal love among brethren. I have always esteemed you brethren highly and have counted many of you among my closest personal friends.

In carefully analyzing your resolution and also our recent conversations, it seems that the following points would perhaps cover the whole matter.

- (1).-My attitude and belief in religious organization.
- (2).-Certain writings of mine that has been construed as derogatory.
- (3).-The question of the "Sovereign Church",

or can a local church remain unaffiliated, or separate and apart from outside control tending to its own affairs and still retain full fellowship with the United Pentecostal Church.

Relative to the first point in the series, permit me to quote from the Foreword of the booklet written by myself entitled, "Scriptural Tithing and New Testament Church Government".

(Quote) . . . "I believe in the concept of constructive religious organization. My entire ministry has been spent in the confines of an organization. Organization has never bound me or held me back from obeying God. I will state without hesitation that what I could have done outside organization, I have been able to do better inside organization. I owe a great debt of gratitude to our organization and to the many precious brethren who make up its constituency. I had rather die today than ever bring reproach upon this body or to fail them in this crucial hour of history".

That I agree with the objectives of this organization can be seen by the support that my church and myself have rendered in past years. For the year of 1967 the church of which I am the Pastor contributed nearly \$5000 to the programs of the United Pentecostal Church. We were second in the state of Texas in Missionary giving. The records will show that this has been the consistent practice of this church throughout the 15 years of my pastorate here.

I have no argument or bone of contention with the brethren who make up the ministerial constituency of this organization. I believe with all my heart in the fundamental message they preach. My fellowship with them and with you is deeply cherished. It would hurt me deeply to have that fellowship severed.

(No. 2) With reference to "**Certain Statements**" and "**remarks**" we regret that they were construed as derogatory to the organization or to any individual. It is our desire to deal with issues and not personalities. What I have written has come from a deep conviction. Its sole purpose was to create and promote safeguards for the continued growth and health and strength of constructive wholesome organization.

(No. 3) Regarding the question of the "Sovereign Church", we wrote what we did with the understanding that the U.P.C. Manual guaranteed the right of a local church to remain sovereign or unaffiliated and still enjoy full fellowship with this organization. Brethren this is a deep conviction of mine.

Regarding the research article entitled, "The Case for the Sovereign Church", please believe me when I say that I wanted to be fair in every way. For that reason I quoted from as many different references as possible, and urged the readers to go to the libraries and check for themselves.

Again let me say that what I have written comes from a deep personal conviction. I deeply regret any mis-understanding or any offense caused by my writings. As sincerely as I know how I was only trying to render a service to this movement. I cannot believe that you brethren would want me to compromise a conviction or refuse to obey God in the future. I believe also that you know me well enough to know that I would never do so.

I cherish my relationship with the United Pentecostal Church. I pray that this relationship will never be lightly severed. It is not my intentions now or in the foreseeable future to sever that relationship. And if it is ever severed, please let me assure you that it will not sever my warm christian regard for you brethren, nor my love

APOSTOLIC STANDARD

Published monthly by the Apostolic Standard publishers Inc. Second-Class postage paid at Melville, Louisiana 71353.

POSTMASTER: Please send form 3547 to Rev. Ray Majors, P. O. Box 432 Melville, Louisiana, 71353.

Murray E. Burr Editor
Ray Majors Circulation Manager

Send all articles or material for publication to Murray E. Burr, 1909 Jefferson Drive, Port Arthur, Texas 77640.

Send all monies or subscriptions for rolls or single copies or all correspondence regarding subscriptions etc. to Ray Majors, P. O. Box 432, Melville, Louisiana 71353.

Subscription rates . . . Single Subscription per year \$2.00. In rolls of ten or more—15 cents per single copy.

BOARD OF PUBLICATION:

Carl Ballesteros	South Bend, Ind.
Verbal Bean	Houston, Texas
M. E. Burr	Port Arthur, Texas
Robert Cavaness	Shelbyville, Ind.
W. A. Cranford	Sulphur, La.
Lee Davis	Riverside, Calif.
Paul Jordan	Indianapolis, Ind.
Roy Lawrence	Laurel, Miss.
Ray Majors	Melville, La.
Frank Munsey	Hammond, Ind.
A. L. O'Brien	Starks, La.
B. A. Spell	Port Allen, La.
C. W. Shew	Fort Worth, Texas
James Maroney	Topeka, Kansas
Kenneth Morgan	Atlanta, Ga.
Donald Haymon	Denver, Colorado

for a movement and a people to which I have given 26 of the best years of my life.

Yours in Him,
Murray E. Burr

To my letter dated March 14, the District Board sent me the following reply.

March 19, 1968

Dear Brother Burr:

The Texas District United Pentacostal Church Board, acting according to Article 6, Section 5, Paragraph 14, Page 40 of the United Pentecostal Church Manual, has instructed this office to inform you of its decision.

As requested by you, we are also sending you a copy of the resolution which the Texas District Board passed concerning the booklet and articles you had written which they felt were in opposition to the teachings of the United Pentecostal Church. Also, incorporated in this writing will be other resolutions passed concerning your case.

In answer to the Board's request, your letter sent to the District Board was read carefully in their attentive hearing. The following resolution was then passed:

"That we recognize Brother Burr's letter not being satisfactory as to what the Board asked of him. The Texas District Board feels that it does not contain the apology asked for and contend that the letter is unsatisfactory."

Following this, then, a resolution was passed, using for its purpose, Article 6, Section 5, Paragraph 21, Page 41 of the United Pentecostal Church Manual:

"That Brother Burr's case be referred to the General Board for their decision." The Board also appointed some of its members to represent the Texas District before the General Board. The Texas District Board also notifies you not to write or publish or have published, in your name, any article, booklet or pamphlet, until this case has had its final disposition.

Furthermore, we assure you, that, all necessary briefs will be fully prepared for the General Board and that you will receive a copy of them in due time so that you can thoroughly review them.

We are earnestly praying that God will work things out for His glory, trusting that our fellowship will not be broken.

With Christian Love we remain,

THE TEXAS DISTRICT BOARD

From the General Secretary in St. Louis I received the following letter.

March 26, 1968

Dear Brother Burr:

Christian greetings!

The Texas District Board has informed us that in a board meeting held immediately following their District Conference, a resolution was passed referring your case to the General Board for a decision. In view of their action, we are setting the time for your trial with the General Board on Wednesday, April 17, 1968, at 9:00 A. M. This meeting will be held at the Gateway Hotel in St. Louis, Missouri, in the Daniel Boone Room.

The trial will be conducted according to our Judicial Procedure, except that the General Board will be the jury. There will not be a right of appeal, as there is not any higher court in the United Pentecostal Church. Inasmuch as you have received a letter from the Texas District Board, you are aware of the charges involved in your case.

Please advise us whether or not you will appear at this time with your counsel to be ready for trial. We would also like for you to inform us beforehand who your counsel will be.

We regret very much that this matter could not be settled without going this far, and we do trust that it all may be worked out in the fear of God.

Awaiting further word from you and with kindest personal regards, I am

Yours in Christ,
UNITED PENTECOSTAL CHURCH

As alert bretheran will note, this whole procedure beginning with the manner in which the summons was given me down to the trial set by the General Board was unconstitutional and completely out of order. Therefore acting on the advice of competent council I declined to appear before the General Board, but sent them the following plea or letter.

The Board of General Presbyters
United Pentecostal Church
St. Louis, Mo.

Dear Brethren:

I pray that in this prepared statement or plea that I shall present to you, none will feel that I am disrespectful or guilty of impertinence. I have a deep respect for each of you. Some of you I have counted as cherished friends down through the years. Furthermore, I believe that God has ordained that I should address you at

this time. Therefore, to be true to the Christ that called me to preach His Word many years ago, I must speak frankly and forthrightly, and perhaps even recklessly. Please believe me also when I say that my heart is singularly free from rancor or bitterness—God knows. He has strangely, yet wonderfully washed my spirit of any feeling of grudge or malice, or ill-will or hatred. I do not come to you abjectly seeking mercy, yet neither do I invite condemnation. I come with my hands raised to Almighty God earnestly praying that His Perfect Will may be made known to me. I pray also that God's Perfect Will may be made plain to a movement and a people in whose ranks I have enjoyed place and warm fellowship in days gone by.

I believe that I am safe in saying that never in the history of the Pentecostal Movement has there ever been a trial such as this. A prominent West Coast Pastor, on reviewing for the first time the details of this tragic affair, expressed not only my own feelings, but the sentiments of scores of concerned ministers from Coast to Coast when in shocked disbelief he said—"Incredible". It is indeed incredible that a movement that was founded on the concept of the sovereign local church; of liberty and freedom for the ministry to fearlessly preach their God-given convictions; who entertained nothing but loathing and horror for anything that smacked of regimentation or dictatorship, could today have drifted into the place where a man stands in danger of being disfellowshipped because he dared challenge the dangerous and brutal and ruthless trends toward totalitarianism that is fast creeping into certain areas of the United Pentecostal Church.

Brethren, were I guilty of sin or gross immorality, or of preaching false doctrine, I would bow my head in shame and quietly slip away into oblivion. But this is not the case. I have not been called to appear before you because

- (1) I am guilty of sin or immorality. My life and ministry for its entire 26 years in this Pentecostal movement is an open book. I challenge any man to put his finger on one single blot, shadow or reproach anywhere.
- (2) I am not being called into question because I have forsaken truth or preached false doctrine; all that know me and have read my writings know that I am deeply fundamental and strongly conservative. My voice for years has been in the forefront of those who are calling for a return to the "Old Paths" that are being so rapidly forsaken. I call upon everyone of

age and experience who witnessed earlier Pentecost to acknowledge that what I have written is exactly what the Jesus Name Movement was founded upon, and that which she held unerringly to—until a decade or so ago. Brethren, I ask you in great earnestness a question that is bearing on the hearts of deeply concerned men everywhere; **Has the time come that there is no longer place or Voice in the United Pentecostal Church for the conservative Preacher?** And if place and voice is still to be found in the U. P. C. for the conservative preacher, is it just one of toleration and nothing more? This is a gravely serious question, and I pray that you brethren will not underestimate its import.

- (3) I am not called into question because I have failed to support financially the program of the United Pentecostal Church. Under my leadership, the church of which I am the Pastor has poured scores of thousands of dollars back into the bloodstream of this Organization. I invite you to check the records, both at headquarters here in St. Louis as well as in the Texas District, Never in my entire ministry have I ever received a letter stating that I had not contributed my share to the tithing program of the District.
- (4) No man can truthfully say that I have not been fair and just in my dealings with my fellow ministers. Ask the men who have pastored churches around me if I ever stooped to Sheep-Stealing or proselyting members. Ask them if I was not a true neighbor and a brother and a friend in every way. Produce the Preacher or Evangelist or official, young or old that can say that my home and my pulpit was not a haven, a refuge and a place of rest, where courtesy and kindness and fellowship and brotherly love was the practiced rule.

Why have I been called upon to suffer the indignity of such an ordeal as this? Let the truth of the matter be proclaimed clearly and forthrightly for spiritual and thoughtful men and women everywhere to read. Is it because I have dared expose the ruthless, brutal hand of religious polities in its bold and heartless move to take over the local church and regiment or subjugate the ministry? I do not say such conditions exist in every district of the United Pentecostal Church. Many of our brethren are shocked and amazed that such things could be so.

But I do say that the necessary By-Laws are already on the books, and they are certainly being taken advantage of in certain areas of this movement. It is to the personal interest of each of you brethren, as well as that of the Organization, to thoroughly investigate every phase of this matter, and to stop the spread of this Spiritual Cancer before it destroys this fellowship.

Efforts have and will be made to shift emphasis away from the real facts of the case; to sidestep, to cloud the real issue with irrelevancies, to bring to the front false issues, but the crux of the whole matter; the hub around which the whole question and purpose of this trial revolves is simply this—**"Can a local Church remain Sovereign, Autonomous, separated and apart from outside control or domination, tending to its own affairs under the headship of its Bishop or Pastor, and still enjoy full fellowship with the United Pentecostal Church without stigma or reproach or intimidation?"**

Brethren, as mature, intelligent, perceptive men I need not remind you that hundreds of ministers throughout the ranks of the United Pentecostal Church are anxiously awaiting your ruling on this matter. I do not believe the issue can be side-stepped any longer. I believe that you are aware that what happens in this room today can seriously affect the future of this entire movement. I plead with you, **Do not let the United Pentecostal Church be branded as a totalitarian Religious Organization;** where the privileges and freedom of the individual minister to write and speak and preach his God-given convictions are ruthlessly crushed under foot.

"DISCREPANCIES IN PROCEDURE"

In studying both the "Manual" as well as the "Judicial Procedure" of the United Pentecostal Church, we have discovered a number of discrepancies in the procedure of this case. Permit me to point them out to you.

- (1) According to the "Judicial Procedure" of the U. P. C. Section 1, Para. B., Pg. 3—A minister's summons must come from the District Superintendent by registered mail. This is to give the defendant time to prepare himself for the investigation, enlist witnesses, etc. My summons was handed me, handwritten and unsigned on a piece of scrap paper by the District Secretary, a few hours before the investigation.
- (2) According to the summons, "**This was not a trial**", but a verdict was reached, and a sentence based on the most humiliating terms was handed down. I pled for more time to consider this sentence, but a strict time limit was placed as to when I must meet their demands.

- (3) On Pg. 5 of the "Judicial Procedure" under Paragraph "E", "The District Board shall set forth in writing satisfactory reasons for said action." Instead of satisfactory reasons, I have been charged with a "**Blanket Charge**", again on a piece of scrap paper and unsigned and nothing set forth or spelled out. I again begged the District Board of Texas to spell out in writing specific charges, or show me where I had violated the manual—**this they refused to do.**
- (4) On Pg. 7, Para. 1, he "Judicial Procedure" guarantees us recourse to a fair and impartial trial, but I am being tried with the General Board acting as the Jury. I do not speak this disrespectfully of you brethren, but under no circumstances could this be termed an unprejudiced jury. Because, every opportunity has been presented for the men on this General Board to discuss this matter among themselves.
- (5) Under Section 6, Para. B., Pg. 8, names of veniremen must be submitted for approval or disapproval by both defendant and plaintiff. By using the General Board as Jury, this right will be denied me.
- (6) According to Section 9, Pg. 13—only members of the Executive Board may be tried before the General Board. On Pg. 15, Para. "D", the General Board is not to conduct a trial or a re-trial. Therefore, I request to be shown, either in the Manual or in the Judicial Procedure where the General Board has the authority to serve as "Jury" in this trial.
- (7) I question the authority of the Texas District Board to refer my case to the General Board. The basis for their alleged authority is Article 6, Sec. 5, Para. 21 in the U.P.C. Manual. But the passage is very unclear, even ambiguous. The way it is written, the minister in question alone has the right to refer the case to the General Board, and not the District Board. The minister is the subject, not the District Board.
And if the District Board does have the authority to refer the case to the General Board, it would have to be only for investigation. If the General Board did drop the man in question from fellowship, he would still have recourse to a fair and impartial trial in his home District and before his own brethren, according to Pg. 7, Section 5, Para. 1 of the Judicial Procedure.

(8) By using the General Board as Jury, all right of appeal is denied me.

Brethren, this is a sad commentary. This "**Judicial Procedure**", was adopted at a General Conference and became the guide-book for all Judicial Action. Yet at a time like this it is completely by-passed. It leaves one with the feeling that we more or less make up the rules as we play the game. Surely you must be aware of how this undermines the confidence of brethren everywhere in this Organization. Can't you see that such meetings as this are but sowing the seeds of disintegration and disaster?

"A Summary of Charges"

In the resolution by the District Board of Texas, dated March 12, 1968, five accusations are made involving remarks in the booklet "Scriptural Tithing and New Testament Church Government", and in the article, "The Case for the Sovereign Church", in the Apostolic Standard, Vol. 1, No. 1. These five accusations are —

- (1) Remarks are made derogatory to this Organization.
- (2) The Spirit in which these writings were written and distributed is in opposition to the interest of this Organization.
- (3) That the opinions expressed are slanted to distort history.
- (4) That these opinions make it appear that the present Organizational structure is not Biblical.
- (5) That these articles are in direct opposition, and contradictory to the teaching of the United Pentecostal Church.

Permit me to say that the burden of proof lies with the accusers. It is easy to say that I have done these things, but it remains to be proven. Let us take the charges one by one and comment on them.

- (1) **Remarks are made derogatory to this Organization** — This I do not believe they can prove except they lift certain statements out of context, making it mean something I did not intend for it to mean.
- (2) **The Spirit in which these writings were written and distributed is in opposition to the interest of this Organization.** "The Lord weigheth the spirits" Pro. 16:2. Can it be that someone would claim to be God that he can weigh a man's spirit? Furthermore, "**What is the interest of this Organization**"? Truth? Or, is it in the interest of this Organization that if there are some unsound practices, that they continue and increase? Is it not in the interest of this Organization to examine our structure and practice that it may ever

be kept sound? We are told to prove all things, 1 Thessa. 5:21. How much more important it is for us to prove what we are doing. Something is wrong with any teaching we practice that will not bear examination and dissent. Truth will stand any test. To be afraid of proving our methods and practices examined and a contrary view voiced, shows fear that they may not be able to stand scrutiny and be exposed as false. Is it actually in the interest of this Organization to stifle questions and dissent on matters not related to fundamental doctrine, but involving only methods and practices? Are these Sacred Cows?

- (3) **The Opinions Expressed are Slanted to distort History.** I plainly and openly quoted from a number of classics as far as religious references are concerned; giving page and volume and urging my readers to check behind me, even giving a list of the subjects to look under. I do not see how a writer could be more honest or above board than this.
- (4) **These opinions make it appear that the present Organizational Structure is not Biblical.** Does the present Organizational structure make it mandatory for local churches to be affiliated? Obviously not, according to Article XVII on Pages 85 and 86. Therefore, to advocate a position provided for in the Manual does not condemn the present Organizational Structure. If it is mandatory for local churches to be affiliated in order to be recognized as worthy of fellowship with the United Pentecostal Church, then all not affiliated would per-force be disfellowshipped. If that is the grounds for disfellowship, then we are saying that affiliation is the basis of salvation, and all out of the U.P.C. are lost, and the U.P.C. is the Bride of Christ. We shall also then change Article II, Sec. 2, Para. 3 of the suggested form of local Church Government on Page 95 so that instead of "**to endeavor to manifest a spirit of brotherly love and fellowship toward all of God's People**", it would read, "**To endeavor to manifest a spirit of brotherly love and fellowship toward only those in the U.P.C.**" Are any of God's People outside of the U.P.C.? If so, then they should be fellowshipped according to this paragraph. Is the U.P.C. broad enough to fellowship all God's People? Have I ceased to be God's child because I believe in the Sovereign local church? If advocating a

position provided for in the Manual condemns the present Organizational structure, then Article XVII, Section 1, Para. 5 also condemns the structure.

(5) **These Articles are in direct opposition and contradictory to the teachings of the United Pentecostal Church.** I ask them to give me chapter and verse. What teachings of the U.P.C., given in the Manual, do these Articles contradict? Is it the teachings of the Manual that churches must affiliate with the U.P.C.? If it is judged to be, then why are so many churches listed in the church directory and recognized as churches in good fellowship that are not affiliated churches? If I am judged guilty, it must be on the grounds that I advocate that local churches should not be affiliated, a position provided for in the Manual, and a position long recognized by the U.P.C. as worthy of fellowship and being listed in the church directory. How then can I be guilty of being in direct opposition and contradictory to the teachings of the U.P.C.? If it is judged to be a teaching of the U.P.C. that the local church must affiliate; and if a man can be condemned for advocating otherwise, then undoubtedly hundreds of Pastors and local churches not affiliated will see the handwriting on the wall so far as they are concerned, for the logical outcome of such a judgment will be to demand affiliation of the local church or else expulsion. **My being disfellowshipped must logically lead to the next step.** Our brethren are not fools. Many will see what this Organization will have come to in that event. If I am disfellowshipped, it will prove that I am right in my warnings about what this Organization will become if the trend towards dominant power is not checked.

It is against abuses of power that I speak. It is against raw, ruthless, dictatorial power, stifling free speech, attempting to increase domination over God's ministry that I protest. If I am condemned and disfellowshipped, it will be obvious this trend has already become the unwritten policy of the U.P.C.

Where will it end? I beseech you, brethren, you who are in places of responsibility given to you by the brethren, to check this thing here and now, and give a resounding "no" to those who seek to make the Organization a crushing machine

seeking to destroy all who dare to have convictions before Almighty God.

On the basis of the reasons stated in this plea, and other reasons not listed, I am advised by competent counsel not to appear for trial. In case any action is taken other than complete exoneration and the cessation of further harassment, I wish for this to be registered as a protest.

Respectfully, Yours in Christ,

Murray E. Burr

ACTION BY THE GENERAL BOARD

April 18, 1968

Dear Brother Burr:

Christian greetings!

We received your letter and were sorry that you did not feel to come. We did err in informing you that it was to be a trial according to the Judicial Procedure. We apologize for this. It was a mis-application of the word trial, and this was done since it was our understanding that it was being referred to the General Board for a final decision.

In reviewing the case, the General Board concluded that it did affect more than one district, therefore the Texas District was within their rights to seek the counsel of the General Board for proper disposition of this matter.

The following resolution was passed by the General Board:

Inasmuch as the Texas District Board has referred the case of M. E. Burr to the General Board, according to Article VI, Section 5, paragraph 21, and after hearing the complaints of the Texas District Board against M. E. Burr, and also after hearing the letter that was written to the General Board from M. E. Burr, postmarked April 13, we appeal to M. E. Burr that he comply with the requirements of the Texas District Board of March 12, 1968, to their satisfaction, and that this be done within ten (10) days from date of the receipt of this decision.

You may rest assured that the entire General Board joins in prayer with you that this can be worked out in the fear of God and without breaking the fellowship.

With kind Christian regards, we remain

Yours in Christ,
UNITED PENTECOSTAL CHURCH
Signed By General Secretary

^① In 1943 at Hot Springs, Arkansas in a General Conference of the Pentecostal Churches Inc.

I was ordained to preach the Gospel. At the Kiel Auditorium in St. Louis Mo. in 1946 I voted for the merger. I have been an ordained minister in good standing with the United Pentecostal Church as long as there has been a United Pentecostal Church.

My wife and I were married by a United Pentecostal Church minister. My daughter, now a junior in college, has never known anything other than the United Pentecostal Church. The majority of the friends and ministers that I cherish most deeply are members of the United Pentecostal Church. My desire has always been to finish my course as a minister and my life as a Christian in the ranks of the United Pentecostal Church. I need not disclose my feelings when I say that this privilege will probably be denied me.

Forgive me if this has a tinge of bitterness; But had I paid 26 years on an insurance policy I would be assured of certain built in options—certain paid-up protection. I could have worked 26 years for the most ruthless corporation in America and there would have been certain basic securities and fringe benefits that no one could deprive me of. At least I would not be stripped of everything and a shadow cast over my name and reputation that would hinder me in earning a living for my family in my chosen profession. BUT SUCH IS NOT MY CASE HERE. Excommunication is a cruel and heartless instrument. The Roman Catholics may or may not have invented it, but we have certainly mastered its techniques. THIS DRAMATICALLY ILLUSTRATES JUST HOW LITTLE ACTUAL SECURITY THIS ORGANIZATION OFFERS THE PREACHER.

I have recently received a new summons to appear again before the District Board of Texas. In-as-much as the former hearings both before the District and General Boards were unconstitutional, this procedure must be carried out to lend legality to their first action. My feelings must somehow be akin to those of the chicken, whose head the farmer's wife failed to cut off with the first blow. Bruised and bleeding and reeling he must be brought back to the block for a second application of the ax. As Abraham Lincoln said, "I'M TOO BIG TO CRY, AND IT HURTS TOO BAD TO LAUGH".

And why am I being disfellowshipped from an organization to which I have given 26 years of the best years of my life? Not because I have committed sin or immorality; Not because I have preached false doctrine; Not because I have failed to support the programs of the organization. Let the facts be stated clearly and positively for fair minded men and women everywhere to read. I am being disfellowshipped because—

- (1).- I have championed the cause of the sovereign church. A privilege and a right fully guaranteed by the manual.
- (2).- Because I have championed freedom of speech and freedom to write. Not to indulge in slander or smear. But to speak and write my God-given convictions as the Holy Ghost and my conscience so directs.

There are those who have questioned me about the political angle of the case; If politics were taken out would there have been a case in the first place? I refuse to believe that the Pentecostal Ministry has so degenerated that it could produce even one man that would ever stoop to political assassination. Neither will I believe that men could be so obsessed with the lust for power that they would destroy a fellow minister's name and reputation and character and his very life and soul to perpetuate themselves in office, or would seek to launch themselves politically on the wreckage of another man's ministry.

I have been urged to seek redress in the courts of the land. This I could never do. I could never bring myself to take my brother to law, especially when the scriptures so emphatically condemns such practices.

Others are urging me to appeal for a jury trial in the event I am dropped from fellowship. I DO NOT INTEND TO PURSUE THE MATTER ANY FURTHER. I have suffered enough harassment. As far as I am concerned this file that I am now publishing in the "STANDARD" will close the case. The matter rests squarely in the hands of the District Board of Texas. It originated with them, it is for them to settle in the light of their own conscience. It would not be appropriate for a jury panel of innocent brethren to relieve them of this responsibility. It is up to them. Let them do what they will.

What I have written came from deep personal conviction. As Martin Luther stated many years ago under similar circumstances, "I CANNOT AND WILL NOT RECANT ANYTHING, SINCE IT IS UNSAFE AND DANGEROUS TO ACT AGAINST ONE'S CONSCIENCE. HERE I STAND. I CAN NOT DO OTHERWISE. SO HELP ME GOD.

AMEN.

EDITORIAL — (Cont. from page one)

mechanics when they try to get near enough to diagnose the trouble or make repairs. Surely there is a striking parallel here. We have provided abso-

lutely no place for self diagnosis, or self analysis; neither will we tolerate self criticism.

"WHAT ARE THE OBJECTIVES OF THIS ORGANIZATION"?

Just what are the objectives of this organization? Are they the same as they were in 1914 when E. N. Bell and Howard A. Goss organized the Assemblies of God? Are they the same as they were in March 1919 when the Pentecostal Assemblies of Louisiana was organized in De Quincy? Are they the same as they were in 1946 when the merger was enacted and the United Pentecostal Church was born? ARE THOSE OBJECTIVES STILL

To Evangelize the world?

To maintain a clean ministry?

To promote holiness and separation from the world and sin?

To guard the freedom and liberty of both churches and ministry?

To maintain the status of the sovereign church?

To guard spirituality and spiritual gifts and ministries, shouting etc?

To guard fundamental doctrine and truth from the encroachment of error?

To perfect a spotless bride for the Lord's soon coming?

To maintain an equal Brotherhood among the ministry?

Or has the emphasis shifted? Has it become the objectives of this organization———

To build an all encompassing political machine where individuality is ruthlessly crushed to the earth?

To build a modern religious tower of Babel taller than all those around us and make a name for ourselves?

To become a full-fledged denomination with all its carnal trappings such as ivy covered institutions, brick and mortar and cultured men of the cloth?

To regiment the ministry and subjugate the local churches?

To substitute political or official ministries for spiritual ministries?

To ape the world and the worldly denominations around us bearing the name Evangelical in dress, in demeanor, in programs, in

conduct and in carnal worldly promotions. To install complete centralized control over every facet of the church?

To install completely the Hierarchy or Episcopal system of church government with its graduated series of rulers or Pastors over Pastors?

To gain worldly acclaim and prestige and merge with the Ecumenical Movement?

My very soul and spirit and body cries out for the warmth and simplicity and freedom of old-time brush-arbor Pentecost. Where brethren were equal and their spirits free; Where government was simple and voting rare; Where spirituality was fervent and faith was high; Where men and women lived holy; Where Hell was preached hot and heaven cheap at any cost; Where the gifts of the spirit operated unfettered and men and women trusted God for their healing; Where politics was unknown, but callouses on both knees and elbows were well known from long hours of soul travail; Where pay was small but rewards were great; Where noble, spiritual men of God feared nothing but to miss the will of God. If something is not done soon, regimented, over-centralized, machine religion will rob us of these blessings.

If only our official brethren everywhere could realize that NOBODY WANTS DIVISION: NOBODY WANTS TO BREAK FELLOWSHIP. That men are only seeking justice and fairness and at least a chance to live and breathe and obey God and our conscience with out being cut down or constantly ridiculed. We have been warned that ITS COLD OUT THERE. Please believe me when I say that it has been cold where some of us have been standing for the last few years. This simple writer has had his motives questioned, his character dissected and his mentality psycho-analyzed, BUT NEVER HAS ANYONE ATTEMPTED, TO ANSWER THE ISSUES, we feel are vital to God's continued blessings on our lives and work. I cannot believe brethren that we now operate on the theory THAT IT IS EASIER TO DESTROY THE MAN THAN TO ANSWER THE TRUTH OF HIS MESSAGE.

We have proved our loyalty to this movement in the past, GIVE US A CHANCE TO PROVE IT IN THE FUTURE. Roll back the move toward over-centralization. Many Pastors as well as lay-